

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, several paragraphs have been amended to correct minor grammatical and typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

No claims have been canceled.

Claim 17, 19 and 20 are being amended, whereby the amendments to these claims do not affect the scope of that claim (they are being made to put this claim in better form for U.S. Patent Practice).

Claims 21-23 are being added.

This amendment adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-23 are now pending in this application.

In the Office Action mailed February 28, 2003, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,796,394 to Wicks; and claims 5, 15, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,244 to Moore. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

First, regarding claim 1, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the claimed processing unit is disclosed in col. 5, lines 5-19 and 39-47 of Wicks.

However, col. 5, lines 5-19 of Wicks merely describes that a base station 108 is connected to a computer 122 via a LAN, that computers 124, 122 and 114 are interconnected via the LAN, and that the radio transmission using the CT-2 standard with the handheld communicator is the primary mode of communication between the base station and the device and the other modes

are secondary modes. Furthermore, col. 5, lines 39-47 of Wicks merely describes that the base station shows graphically whether the user or any other user has electronic mail, voice messages, faxes, etc., and that the user can retrieve voice messages, have the electronic mail and faxes delivered to the user's computer, have a fax printed out, copy the information to other users, place the information in a low priority stack or perform other functions, by pressing a key on the handheld communicator or the base station.

In contrast, the claimed processing unit is explicitly required to obtain a prescribed information regarding the computer network that is necessary or utilizable in operating an application program, from the other computer device connected to the portable terminal device via the local network. The quoted portions of Wicks fail to disclose or suggest a portable terminal device that obtains any such information regarding the computer network from the local network.

Moreover, the claimed processing unit is explicitly required to carry out a prescribed processing for the application program according to at least a part of the prescribed information, and execute the application program by using a result of the prescribed processing. The quoted portions of Wicks also fail to disclose or suggest a portable terminal device that carries out any such processing according to the information obtained from the local network, and executes the application program by using the result of this processing.

Thus, Wicks fails to disclose or suggest anything corresponding to the claimed processing unit, and therefore claim 1 cannot be anticipated by Wicks.

It is to be noted that claim 1 is directed to an improvement of handling of a user interface or omission of tedious operations in a portable terminal device which has a function for connecting to a prescribed computer network and a function for executing application programs, but which is also associated with a poor handling of a user interface because of its compact or very compact body size (see page 4, lines 17-26 and page 34, lines 23 to page 35, line 17 of the present specification). Wicks provides no teaching directed to such a portable

terminal device with an improved handling of a user interface or omission of tedious operations.

The same argument also applies to corresponding method and medium claims 17 and 19, as well as dependent claims 2-14.

Next, regarding claim 15, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the claimed processing unit is disclosed in col. 4, line 48 to col. 5, line 5 of Moore.

However, col. 4, line 48 to col. 5, line 5 of Moore merely describes that the memory of the processing system includes a selective call address, a message processing element, and codebooks utilized for compressing/decompressing messages which can be downloaded wirelessly or through a wired network via a conventional wireline interface.

In contrast, the processing unit as recited in claim 15 is explicitly required to return a reply containing an identification information for identifying a specific type of application program that exists in the computer device, or a prescribed information related to the specific type of application program, in response to a request from the portable terminal device via the local network. The quoted portion of Moore fails to disclose or suggest any such information related to the specific type of application program, as well as any computer device that returns a reply containing such an information to the portable terminal device via the local network. Wicks, as acknowledged in the Office Action, does not teach the features of the processing unit of claim 15.

Thus, the combination of Wicks and Moore fails to disclose, teach or suggest anything corresponding to the claimed processing unit, and claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Wicks and Moore.

It is to be noted that claim 15 is directed to a computer device that supports a portable terminal device in order to enable improvement of handling of a user interface or omission of tedious operations in the portable terminal device of claim 1 (see page 4, lines 27-34 and page 35, lines 18-29 of the present specification). Please note that Wicks and Moore provide no teaching directed to such a computer device for supporting the portable terminal device.

The same argument also applies to corresponding method and medium claims 18 and 20, as well as dependent claim 16.

In conclusion, the rejections in the Office Action based on Wicks and Moore are incorrect, and thus claims 1-20 are patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

New claims 21, 22 and 23 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to be patentable over the combination of Wicks and Moore. In dependent claim 21, a portable terminal device provides the only mechanism for transferring information from a computer device to another computer device. Wicks, on the other hand, necessarily uses a base station 108 in a data transfer path between computers in his network. Also, new method claim 22 recites a series of steps involved in transferring data from a first computer device to a second computer, by using only a local network and a portable terminal device, whereby Wicks teaches a method in which a base station 108 must also be involved in a transfer of information between any two of his computers on his network. As recited in dependent claim 23, the local network is a wireless network.

Accordingly, since there are no other objections or rejections raised in the Office Action, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Applicants' representative will be calling the Examiner to set up an interview in the near future, in order to discuss the presently pending claims and the cited art of record.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

August 26, 2003

Philip J. Articola
Philip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399